arXiv:1102.4209v2 [math.RT] 27 Jun 2011

SINGULAR LOCALIZATION FOR QUANTUM GROUPS AT GENERIC q.

ERIK BACKELIN AND KOBI KREMNIZER

Abstract. We quantize parabolic flag manifolds and describe categories of equivariant quantum $\mathcal{D}$-modules on them at a singular central character. We compute global sections at any $q \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and we also prove a singular version of Beilinson-Bernstein localization for a quantized enveloping algebra $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, when q is generic.

1. Introduction

This note is part of our ongoing project on localization and representation theory of quantum groups. Localization theory started with the celebrated localization theorem of Beilinson and Bernstein, [BB81], which we remind goes as follows: Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a complex semi-simple Lie algebra, $\mathfrak{h}$ a Cartan subalgebra and $\mathcal{B}$ the flag manifold of $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ be regular and dominant and let I_λ be the corresponding maximal ideal in the center of $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})$. Let $\mathcal{D}^\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ be the sheaf of λ-twisted differential operators on $\mathcal{B}$. Then $\Gamma(\mathcal{D}^\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}) \cong \mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})^\lambda := \mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})/(I_\lambda)$ and $\Gamma : \mathcal{D}^\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-mod} \to \mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})^\lambda\text{-mod}$ is an equivalence of categories. For applications and details we recommend the book [HTT08].

The next fundamental step was taken by Bezrukavnikov, Mircovic and Rumynin, [BMR08]. They did Beilinson-Bernstein localization in finite characteristic at regular central character and later in [BMR06] at singular central character, at the level of derived categories, utilizing the techniques of Azumaya algebras.

The authors did localization for a quantum group $\mathrm{U}_q := \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ at a generic $q \in \mathbb{C}^*$ in [BK06] and at a root of unity in [BK08] - in both papers for regular central character, in the latter motivated by the ideas of [BMR08]. In [BK10] we also did localization for the complex enveloping algebra case at a singular central character.

In this paper we consider singular localization for U_q. Let us sketch the basic constructions:

We shall merely assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is a reductive Lie algebra and we let G be a reductive group such that $Lie\, G = \mathfrak{g}$. Let $P \subseteq G$ be a parabolic subgroup and let $\mathcal{P} = G/P$ be the corresponding parabolic flag manifold. First we quantize $\mathcal{P}$ the same way as we quantized $\mathcal{B}$ in [BK06]. We remind that this is done as follows: Observe that the category $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}$-mod of quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathcal{P}$ is equivalent to the category $(\mathcal{O}(G), P)$-mod of P-equivariant $\mathcal{O}(G)$-modules, since G is affine. Since an algebraic P-action is the same thing as an $\mathcal{O}(P)$-coaction the latter category admits a quantization.

Indeed, let $\mathcal{O}_q := \mathcal{O}_q(G)$ and $\mathcal{O}_q(P)$ be the quantized Hopf algebras of functions on G and P, respectively, and let $(\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod be the category whose objects are $\mathcal{O}_q$-modules and $\mathcal{O}_q(P)$-comodules with a certain equivariance compatibility, see Section 3.1. According to Grothendieck a space is the same thing as its category of sheaves, so we think of $(\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod as a quantization $\mathcal{P}_q$ of $\mathcal{P}$. In Proposition 3.3 we give a quantum counterpart to Serre's description of projective varieties.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14-A22, 17B37, 53B32.

Then we fix a weight λ and chose P such that the singular roots of λ are contained in the P-parabolic roots. [BMR06] considered a sheaf $\mathcal{D}^{\lambda}_{\mathcal{P}}$ of certain extended differentials operators in characteristic p on $\mathcal{P}$ that locally looks like $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{P}}$ tensored with the primitive quotient determined by λ of the enveloping algebra of the Levi-factor of $Lie\, P$. In [BK10] we considered the same sheaf in characteristic 0.

Here we use the equivariant language to quantize the category $\mathcal{D}^{\lambda}_{\mathcal{P}}$-mod, see Section 4.2. We then describe global sections in Theorem 4.1, for any q (except perhaps roots of unity of order smaller than the Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}$).

At a generic q we prove a version of Beilinson-Bernstein localization, Theorem 5.1. The proof is close to that given in [BK10], which in turn is a variation of the argument of [BB81].

Let us remark that [BK10] used singular localization to give a $\mathcal{D}$-module interpretation of translation functors and also to give a new description of singular blocks in the Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand category $\mathbb{O}$, generalizing results of [Soe86]. The same thing can be done for U_q at a generic q, with practically exactly the same methods. We have omitted this here.

In a subsequent paper we will do singular localization for U_q, for q a root of unity. Our description of global sections given here will be important in that paper. Just as in the modular case and the regular quantum group case Beilinson-Bernstein localization will then only hold at the level of derived categories. This is the most interesting case and we shall use this and the results of [BMR06, BM10] to compare the representation theory of U_q with the representation theory of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$, when $q^p = 1$.

We advice the reader to look at [BK10] before this paper. That paper was written with the present in mind and the geometric ideas behind the equivariant definitions given here are explained there. Quantum groups are technically harder to work with than enveloping algebras in the context of localization theory because, for instance, the adjoint action of U_q on itself is not integrable (see Section 2.6) and PBW-bases and (parabolic) triangular decompositions are more complicated than in the classical case.

Once those technical complications are overcome we will see, however, that the conceptual difference to the enveloping algebra case is small.

2. Preliminaries on quantum groups

We work over $\mathbb{C}$. q will always denote a complex invertible number such that $q^2 \neq 1$. We say that q is *generic* if q is not a root of unity.

In this section we recall some facts about quantum groups. The material here is mostly standard. This paper is a continuation of the papers [BK06, BK08]. Let us mention that we shall not particularly follow the notations of those papers, but rather "quantize" those of [BK10].

[CP95] is our main reference for the material here. See also Section 6.1 for some facts about Hopf algebras that will be used here.

2.1. **Root data.** Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a reductive Lie algebra and let $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a Cartan subalgebra contained in a Borel subalgebra. Let $\mathfrak{n} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ be the unipotent radical. Let $\overline{\mathfrak{b}}$ be the opposite Borel and $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}$ its unipotent radical. We denote by $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ the enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and by $\mathscr{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ the center of $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})$.

Let Δ be the simple roots, let Λ be the lattice of integral weights and let Λ_r be the root lattice. Let Λ_+ and Λ_{r+} be the positive weights and the positive integral linear combinations of the simple roots, respectively.

Let $\mathcal{W}$ be the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}$. We let $\langle\, ,\, \rangle$ denote a $\mathcal{W}$-invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{h}^\star$ normalized by $\langle\gamma,\gamma\rangle = 2$ for each short root γ.

Let $T_\Lambda := \mathrm{Hom}_{groups}(\Lambda, \mathbb{C}^\star) = Maxspec\, \mathbb{C}\Lambda$ be the character group of Λ, where $\mathbb{C}\Lambda$ is the group algebra of Λ. The $\mathcal{W}$-action on Λ induces a $\mathcal{W}$-action on T_Λ. We define the $\bullet$-action of $\mathcal{W}$ on T_Λ by $w \bullet \lambda = w(\lambda+\rho) - \rho$, where ρ is the half sum of the positive roots. For $\mu \in \Lambda$ we define $q^\mu \in T_\Lambda$ by the formula $q^\mu(\gamma) = q^{\langle\mu,\gamma\rangle}$, for $\gamma \in \Lambda$. For any $\alpha \in \Delta$, put $d_\alpha := \langle\alpha,\alpha\rangle/2$.

Let G be a connected reductive algebraic group such that $G/\mathcal{Z}(G)$ is simply connected (where $\mathcal{Z}(G)$ is the center of G) and $Lie\, G = \mathfrak{g}$. Let B be the Borel subgroup of G with $Lie\, B = \mathfrak{b}$. Let $P \supseteq B$ be a parabolic subgroup of G and let $\mathfrak{p} = Lie\, P$. Let R be the unipotent radical and let L be the Levi-factor of P and denote by $\mathfrak{r}$ and $\mathfrak{l}$ their respective Lie algebras. Let $\Delta_P \subseteq \Delta$ be the P-parabolic roots (so $\Delta_B = \emptyset$, $\Delta_G = \Delta$). Write $\overline{P}$, $\overline{R}$, $\overline{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{r}}$ for their respective opposite groups and Lie algebras.

Let $\lambda \in T_\Lambda$ and put $\Delta_\lambda = \{\alpha \in \Delta; s_\alpha \bullet \lambda = \lambda\}$. We say that

- λ is *P-regular* if $\Delta_\lambda \subseteq \Delta_P$. λ is regular if it is B-regular, i.e. if $Stab_{(\mathcal{W},\bullet)}(\lambda) = \{e\}$.
- λ is a *P-character* if λ is integral and $\lambda(K_\alpha) = 1$, for $\alpha \in \Delta_P$.

2.2. **Quantized enveloping algebras.**

2.2.1. Let $(a_{\alpha\beta})_{\alpha,\beta\in\Delta}$ be the Cartan matrix of $\mathfrak{g}$. Chose integers d_α so that $(d_\alpha a_{\alpha\beta})$ is symmetric and define a new bilinear form $\langle\, ,\, \rangle_d$ on Λ by $\langle\mu,\nu\rangle_d = \sum d_\alpha f_\alpha \langle\alpha,\nu\rangle$, for $\mu,\nu \in \Lambda$ and $\mu = \sum f_\alpha \alpha$, $f_\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$. Put $q_\alpha = q^{d_\alpha}$.

Let $\mathrm{U}_q := \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ be the simply connected quantized enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Recall that U_q has $\mathbb{C}$-algebra generators $E_\alpha, F_\alpha, K_\mu$, for $\alpha,\beta \in \Delta$ and $\mu \in \Lambda$. These are subject to the relations

$$K_\lambda K_\mu = K_{\lambda+\mu},\quad K_0 = 1,$$
$$K_\mu E_\alpha K_{-\mu} = q^{\langle\mu,\alpha\rangle_d} E_\alpha,\quad K_\mu F_\alpha K_{-\mu} = q^{-\langle\mu,\alpha\rangle_d} F_\alpha,$$
$$[E_\alpha,\, F_\beta] = \delta_{\alpha,\beta}\frac{K_\alpha - K_{-\alpha}}{q_\alpha - q_\alpha^{-1}}$$

and certain Serre-relations that we do not recall here. We have

$$\triangle K_\mu = K_\mu \otimes K_\mu,\ \triangle E_\alpha = K_\alpha \otimes E_\alpha + E_\alpha \otimes 1,\ \triangle F_\alpha = 1 \otimes F_\alpha + F_\alpha \otimes K_{-\alpha}$$
$$S(K_\mu) = K_{-\mu},\ S(E_\alpha) = -K_{-\alpha}E_\alpha,\ S(F_\alpha) = -F_\alpha K_\alpha$$
$$\epsilon(K_\mu) = 1, \epsilon(E_\alpha) = \epsilon(F_\alpha) = 0$$

2.2.2. Let $\mathcal{O}_q = \mathcal{O}_q(G)$ be the algebra of matrix coefficients of finite dimensional type-1 representations of U_q. This is a quantization of the algebra of functions $\mathcal{O}(G)$ on G. There is a natural pairing $\langle\, ,\, \rangle : \mathrm{U}_q \otimes \mathcal{O}_q \to \mathbb{C}$. This gives a U_q-bimodule structure on $\mathcal{O}_q$ as follows

$$\mu_l(u)(a) := ua := a_1\langle u, a_2\rangle,\ \ \mu_r(u)(a) := au := \langle u, a_1\rangle a_2,\ \ u \in \mathrm{U}_q, a \in \mathcal{O}_q \tag{2.1}$$

so that μ_l is a left action and μ_r is a right action. Then $\mathcal{O}_q$ is the (restricted) dual of U_q with respect to this pairing. Quantizing the enveloping algebras $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{p})$ and $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{l})$ gives Hopf subalgebras of U_q:

$$\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{C}\langle K_\mu, E_\alpha, F_\beta; \mu \in \Lambda, \alpha \in \Delta, \beta \in \Delta_P\rangle \text{ and}$$
$$\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}) = \mathbb{C}\langle K_\mu, E_\alpha, F_\beta; \mu \in \Lambda, \alpha,\beta \in \Delta_P\rangle$$

In particular, $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{h})$ is isomorphic to the group algebra $\mathbb{C}\Lambda$.

There is the counit $\epsilon : \mathrm{U}_q \to \mathbb{C}$. We put $\mathrm{U}_{q>0} = \mathrm{Ker}\,\epsilon$ and for any subalgebra R of U_q we put $R_{>0} = R \cap \mathrm{U}_{q>0}$.

A quantization of $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$ (and of $\mathrm{U}_q(\bar{\mathfrak{r}})$) will be given in Section 6.2. This is rather involved. Let us here mention its most important properties which are that it is a tensor complement in $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$ to $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})$, is stable and integrable under the right adjoint action of $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$ and specializes to $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{r})$ at $q = 1$. Moreover, the case $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{n}$ leads to a slightly non-standard definition of $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{n})$.

2.2.3. We let $\mathcal{O}_q(P)$ and $\mathcal{O}_q(L)$ be the quotient Hopf-algebras of $\mathcal{O}_q$ corresponding to the subalgebras $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$ and $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})$ of U_q, respectively, by means of the duality between $\mathcal{O}_q$ and U_q.

2.3. **Modules and comodules.**

2.3.1. We shall often call a right (resp., left) $\mathcal{O}_q$-comodule a left (resp., right) G_q-module. For a (right) G_q-module M we denote by $M^{G_q} = \{m \in M; \triangle m = 1 \otimes m\}$ the set of G_q-invariants. (Similarly, there are P_q-,L_q-modules, etc.)

Let $Q \supseteq P$ be a parabolic subgroup of G. $\mathcal{O}_q(Q)$ is naturally a $Q_q - P_q$-bimodule. Using the antipode we can make a right P_q-module into a left P_q-module. Because of this we shall freely pass between $Q_q - P_q$-bimodules and vector spaces equipped with commuting left Q_q and P_q-module structures.

We have an adjoint pair of functors

$$Res^{P_q}_{Q_q} : Q_q\text{-mod} \rightleftarrows P_q\text{-mod} : Ind^{Q_q}_{P_q} \tag{2.2}$$

where $Res^{P_q}_{Q_q}(M) = M$ as a set and the P_q-module structure is the restriction of the of Q_q-module structure, i.e. the $\mathcal{O}_q(P)$-comodule structure is the composition $M \overset{\triangle}{\to} M \otimes \mathcal{O}_q(Q) \to M \otimes \mathcal{O}_q(P)$, for $M \in Q_q$-mod. $Ind^{Q_q}_{P_q}(N) = (\mathcal{O}_q(Q) \otimes N)^{P_q}$, for $N \in P_q$-mod and the P_q-invariants are taken with respect to the diagonal P_q-action. The Q_q-action on $Ind^{Q_q}_{P_q}(N)$ is given by the left $\mathcal{Q}_q$-action on $\mathcal{O}_q(Q)$.

2.3.2. For $M \in Q_q$-mod and $N \in P_q$-mod there is the *tensor identity*

$$M \otimes Ind^{Q_q}_{P_q} N \overset{\sim}{\to} Ind^{Q_q}_{P_q} M \otimes N,\ m \otimes (a \otimes n) \mapsto m_1 a \otimes m_2 \otimes n \tag{2.3}$$

which is an isomorphism of Q_q-modules.

2.3.3. Suppose that $\lambda \in T_\Lambda$. We observe that there exists an irreducible left P_q-module $V_{P_q}(\lambda)$ with highest weight λ iff $\lambda(K_\alpha) \in \{1, q, q^2, \ldots\}$, for $\alpha \in \Delta_P$, when q is generic (at a root of unity there is a similar condition). Note that $V_{L_q}(\lambda) := V_{P_q}(\lambda)$ is an irreducible representation for L_q. Of course, $\dim V_{P_q}(\lambda) = 1 \iff \lambda$ is a P_q-character.

2.3.4. Let $P \subseteq Q$ be parabolic subgroups of G and let L' be the Levi factor of Q. We state for the record

Lemma 2.1. *For any P_q-module M, $Ind^{L'_q}_{(L' \cap P)_q} M$ carries a natural structure of Q_q-module. There is a natural isomorphism of Q_q-modules*

$$\tau : Ind^{Q_q}_{P_q}(M) \overset{\sim}{\to} Ind^{L'_q}_{(L' \cap P)_q}(M) \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{O}_q(Q) \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{O}_q(L')$ be the algebra homomorphism which is dual to the inclusion $\mathrm{U}_q(Lie\, L') \hookrightarrow \mathrm{U}_q(Lie\, Q)$. We then define $\tau(f \otimes m) = p(f) \otimes m$, for $f \otimes m \in Ind_{P_q}^{Q_q}(M)$. It is straightforward to verify that this is an isomorphism. The Q_q-action on the right hand side is now defined by transportation of structure. □

2.4. The center of U_q and the Harish-Chandra homomorphism.

2.4.1. Let $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ denote the center of an algebra A. Put $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}(\mathrm{U}_q)$. Then $\mathcal{Z}$ contains the Harish-Chandra center $\mathcal{Z}^{HC}$ and, if q is a primitive l'th root of unity, $\mathcal{Z}$ also contains the l-center $\mathcal{Z}^{(l)}$, which is generated by E_α^l, F_α^l and K_μ^l, $\alpha \in \Delta, \mu \in \Lambda$.

Let us now describe $\mathcal{Z}^{HC}$. Let Γ be the group of all group homomorphisms from Λ to $\{\pm\}$. Thus $\Gamma = \langle \sigma_\alpha; \alpha \in \Delta \rangle$, where $\sigma_\alpha(\omega_\beta) = (-1)^{\delta_{\alpha,\beta}}$ and the ω_β's are the fundamental weights, $\beta \in \Delta$. Γ has a natural action of $\mathcal{W}$, so we can form $\tilde{\mathcal{W}} := \Gamma \rtimes \mathcal{W}$. We consider the following action of $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$ on $\mathbb{C}\Lambda$: the subgroup $\mathcal{W}$ act by the $\bullet$-action and $\sigma \in \Gamma$ act by $\sigma(K_\lambda) = \sigma(\lambda) K_\lambda$, for $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Let $\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}}$ be the invariant ring. Observe that $\mathbb{C}\Lambda^\Gamma = \mathbb{C}2\Lambda$ so that $\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}} = \mathbb{C}2\Lambda^{\mathcal{W}}$. There is the Harish-Chandra isomorphism

$$\chi : \mathcal{Z}^{HC} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}}$$

For $\lambda \in T_\Lambda$ let $\chi_\lambda : \mathcal{Z}^{HC} \to \mathbb{C}$ be the corresponding central character. This construction is standard when $\mathfrak{g}$ is semi-simple. Our reductive $\mathfrak{g}$ can be written as a direct sum of Lie algebras: $\mathfrak{g} = [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] \oplus \mathcal{Z}_\mathfrak{g}$, where $\mathcal{Z}_\mathfrak{g}$ is the center of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ is semi-simple. Thus, $\mathcal{Z}_\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{h}$ and we have $\mathrm{U}_q = \mathrm{U}_q([\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]) \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathcal{Z}_\mathfrak{g})$ (where $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathcal{Z}_\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathbb{C}\Lambda$). The Harish-Chandra homomorphism χ for U_q can thus be described as the product $\chi = \chi_{[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]} \otimes Id_{\mathrm{U}_q(\mathcal{Z}_\mathfrak{g})}$, where $\chi_{[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]}$ is the Harish-Chandra isomorphism for the quantum group $\mathrm{U}_q([\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}])$.

If q is an l'th root of unity we have $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}^{HC} \otimes_{\mathcal{Z}^{(l)} \cap \mathcal{Z}^{HC}} \mathcal{Z}^{(l)}$ and if q is not a root of unity we have $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}^{HC}$.

Note that to describe $\mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))$ we should consider $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P = \Gamma_P \rtimes \mathcal{W}_P$ where $\Gamma_P = \langle \sigma_\alpha; \alpha \in \Delta_P \rangle$. We get then the Harish-Chandra isomorphism

$$\chi_\mathfrak{l} : \mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}.$$

2.4.2. Part **i)** of the following lemma is standard and part **ii)** is proved in [BK10] for the enveloping algebra case and the proof in the generic quantum case is the same.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that q is generic. Let $\lambda \in T_\Lambda$.* ***i)*** *Then λ is dominant iff for all $\mu \in \Lambda_{r+} \setminus \{0\}$ we have $\chi_{\lambda+\mu} \neq \chi_\lambda$*

ii) *Let λ be P-regular and dominant. Let μ be a P-character. Then for any $\psi \in \Lambda(V_{G_q}(\mu)), \psi \neq \mu$, we have $\chi_{\lambda+\mu} \neq \chi_{\lambda+\psi}$.*

2.5. Integral versions of U_q.

2.5.1. Let t be a parameter and let U_t be the $\mathbb{C}(t)$-algebra defined by the same generators as U_q and modulo the relations obtained by substituting t for q in the defining relations of U_q. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}]$. Let $\mathrm{U}_\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{res}}$ be Lusztig's integral form of U_q, the $\mathcal{A}$-algebra in U_t generated by divided powers $E_\alpha^{(n)} = E_\alpha^n / [n]_{d_\alpha}!$, $F_\alpha^{(n)} = F_\alpha^n / [n]_{d_\alpha}!$, α a simple root, $n \geq 1$ (where $[m]_d = \frac{\prod_{s=1}^m q^{d \cdot s} - q^{-d \cdot s}}{q^d - q^{-d}}$) and the K_μ's, $\mu \in P$. There is also the De Consini-Kac integral form $\mathrm{U}_\mathcal{A}$, which is generated over $\mathcal{A}$ by the E_α, F_α and K_μ's. The subalgebra $\mathrm{U}_\mathcal{A}$ is preserved by the left (and right) adjoint actions of $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathrm{res}}$. The braid operators T_w preserves these integral versions.

$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is defined to be the dual of $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathrm{res}}$. This is a Hopf $\mathcal{A}$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_q$.

Similarly we get integral versions $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p})$ and $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathrm{res}}(\mathfrak{p})$ that are subalgebras of $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathrm{res}}$, respectively.

Specializing $t \mapsto q$ we get $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$ and $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{res}}(\mathfrak{p})$ as well. For a generic q we have $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{res}}(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$.

2.6. **Integrable part of U_q.**

2.6.1. *Integrability of modules.* A (say right) $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{res}}$-module M is called integrable if there is a G_q-module structure on it such that $um = \langle u, m_1 \rangle m_2$, for $u \in \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{res}}, m \in M$, $m_1 \otimes m_2$ is the coaction on m and $\langle\ ,\ \rangle : \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{res}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_q \to \mathbb{C}$ is the natural pairing. At a generic q we have that M is integrable iff the $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{res}}$-action is locally finite and the K_μ's act by integer eigenvalues. For q a root of unity and M a U_q-module which admits an $\mathcal{A}$-form $M_{\mathcal{A}}$ we have that M is integrable if the $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathrm{res}}$-action on M is locally finite and the K_μ's act by integer eigenvalues.

Any (right) $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{res}}$-module M has a unique maximal submodule $M^{\mathrm{int}} := M^{\mathfrak{g}\text{-}\mathrm{int}}$ on which the $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{res}}$-action integrates to a G_q-action. Similarly, there is $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})$-integrability and the maximal $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})$-integrable submodule $M^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}\mathrm{int}}$ of a given $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module M.

On the other hand, a G_q-module structure on a vector space M always differentiates to a U_q-module structure on M.

2.6.2. It is a technical complication with quantum groups that the adjoint (left or right) action of $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{res}}$ on U_q does not integrate to a G_q-action. We consider here the right action. It is easy to see that $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} := \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{g}\text{-}\mathrm{int}}$ is a subalgebra of U_q. More generally, $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}\mathrm{int}}$ is an algebra. $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}\mathrm{int}}$ is a left coideal in U_q, i.e. $\triangle\, \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}\mathrm{int}} \subset \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}\mathrm{int}} \otimes \mathrm{U}_q$ (but it is not a Hopf subalgebra).

$\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$ was first systematically studied in [JL92]. (They called it the "ad-finite" subalgebra, but since this is misleading at a root of unity we prefer the name "ad-integrable". In the papers [BK06, BK08] we also called it U_q^{fin} instead of $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$.) Let ω_i and α_i, $1 \leq i \leq r := \operatorname{rank} \mathfrak{g}$, be the fundamental weights and the simple roots, respectively. To give the reader a feeling for $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$ we state:

Lemma 2.3. *i)* $K_{2\omega_i}, K_{2\omega_i - \alpha_i} E_{\alpha_i}$ *and* $K_{2\omega_i} F_{\alpha_i} \in \mathrm{U}_q^{int}$. *ii)* $\mathrm{U}_q^{int} \otimes_{\mathrm{U}_q^{int} \cap \mathbb{C}\Lambda} \mathbb{C}\Lambda = \mathrm{U}_q$.

Proof. A computation (inside $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}$) shows that

$$ad_r^2(E_{\alpha_i})(K_{2\omega_i}) = ad_r(E_{\alpha_j})(K_{2\omega_i}) = ad_r^2(F_{\alpha_i})(K_{2\omega_i}) = ad_r(F_{\alpha_j})(K_{2\omega_i}) = 0,\ i \neq j.$$

An application of the PBW-theorem shows that this implies that $K_{2\omega_i} \in \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$, for all i. Since $K_{2\omega_i - \alpha_i} E_{\alpha_i} \sim ad_r(E_{\alpha_i})(K_{2\omega_i})$ and $K_{2\omega_i} F_{\alpha_i} \sim ad_r(F_{\alpha_i})(K_{2\omega_i})$ (where $\sim$ means equal up to a non-zero scalar) we have proved *i)*. *ii)* follows from *i)*. □

We have $\mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q) \subseteq \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$. Let $\mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}) := \mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q)$ be the Harish-Chandra center of $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$. On the other hand $\mathcal{Z}^{(l)}(\mathrm{U}_q) \nsubseteq \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$, for q an l'th root of unity.

Example 2.4. We have $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)^{\mathrm{int}} = \mathbb{C}\langle KF, K, E, z\rangle$, where $z = \frac{qK + q^{-1}K^{-1}}{(q-q^{-1})^2} + FE \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2))$ is the Casimir operator. Thus $\mathbb{C}\Lambda_+^{\mathrm{int}} = \mathbb{C}[K]$ and $\mathbb{C}\Lambda = \mathbb{C}[L]$, where $L^2 = K$.

Another important feature is that, contrary to U_q, $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$ is free over its Harish-Chandra center, except possibly for a finite set of roots of unity, see [JL92, B00, BK11]. This freeness property holds only for the simply connected version of U_q which is a main reason we work with that version.

We are primary interested in the representation theory of U_q, but it will be $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$ that occurs naturally as global sections, see Theorem 4.1. However, we remark that the representation theories of U_q and $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$ are very similar. This will be precisely explained in the next section.

Following [JL94] we define

Definition 2.5. Let $\lambda \in T_\Lambda$. Put $\mathrm{U}_q^\lambda := \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} / (\mathrm{Ker}\, \chi_\lambda)$.

The right G_q-action on $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$, resp. on U_q^λ, that is obtained by integrating $ad_r(\mathrm{U}_q)$ is called the right adjoint G_q-action and again denoted by ad_r.

Remark 2.6. There was a misprint in the paper [BK06] which unfortunately, partly, moved on to [BK08]; there we defined U_q^λ to be $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} / Ann_{\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}}(M_\lambda)$. At a generic q this is the same as the correct definition 2.5 given here but at a root of unity it is wrong.

2.7. **Verma modules and universal Verma modules.**

2.7.1. There is the Verma module $M_\lambda := \mathrm{U}_q \otimes_{\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{b})} \mathbb{C}_\lambda$ for U_q with highest weight $\lambda \in T_\Lambda$, where $\mathbb{C}_\lambda$ is the 1-dimensional representation of $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{b})$ defined by λ. For q generic we have the *quantum Duflo formula* (see [JL94] and [BK11])

$$Ann_{\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}}(M_\lambda) = \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} \cdot \mathrm{Ker}\, \chi_\lambda.$$

Let $\lambda \in T_\Lambda$ and let μ_λ be the highest weight vector of M_λ. Denote by $M_\lambda|_{\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}}$ the Verma module M_λ considered as a module for the subalgebra $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$ of U_q. Restriction defines an algebra map $\phi : T_\Lambda \to T_{\Lambda^{\mathrm{int}}} := Maxspec\,(\mathbb{C}\Lambda \cap \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}})$. We get

Lemma 2.7. *$\mathrm{U}_q^{int} \cdot \mu_\lambda = M_\lambda$. Moreover, if if $\lambda, \lambda' \in T_\Lambda$ satisfy $\phi(\lambda) = \phi(\lambda')$ then $M_\lambda|_{\mathrm{U}_q^{int}} \cong M_{\lambda'}|_{\mathrm{U}_q^{int}}$. Here $M_\lambda|_{\mathrm{U}_q^{int}}$ denotes M_λ considered as a module over U_q^{int}.*

Remark that we could also have considered Verma modules for $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$ to be parameterized by $T_{\Lambda^{\mathrm{int}}}$. It is sometimes a subtle issue which version of the quantum group one should use, i.e. which functions on the tori one should include. We have chosen to work with the simply connected version - because it is free over $\mathcal{Z}^{HC}$ - but note that *all* versions of U_q have the same Verma modules, as sets, and that they are parameterized by the spectra of the torus part of the quantum group in question.

Definition 2.8. Let $\widetilde{M}_{P_q} := \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} / \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \cdot \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})_{>0}$ be a "P_q-universal" Verma module for $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$. For $\lambda \in T_\Lambda$ let $M_{P_q,\lambda} := \widetilde{M}_{P_q} \otimes_{\mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))} \mathbb{C}_\lambda$.

Here $\mathbb{C}_\lambda$ is the 1-dimensional representation for $\mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))$ on which $z \in \mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))$ acts by $\chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda}(z)$. Observe that the right adjoint action ad_r of $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$ on $\widetilde{M}_{P_q}$ integrates to a P_q-action. We shall always consider $\widetilde{M}_{P_q}$ with this P_q-action and in particular its restricted L_q-action.

Observe that for $P = B$ we have that $M_{B_q,\lambda}$ coincides with the usual Verma module M_λ.

By corollary 6.4 we see that the canonical map $\mathrm{U}_q(\overline{\mathfrak{p}})^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \to \widetilde{M}_{P_q}$ is an isomorphism of L_q-modules.

2.7.2. Denote by $\Lambda(V)$ the set of weights of a U_q-module V. We shall need a quantum version of a classical result of Bernstein and Gelfand:

Lemma 2.9. *Let V be a finite dimensional U_q^{int}-module and assume that M is a U_q^{int}-module such that $\operatorname{Ker}\chi_\lambda \cdot M = 0$. Then $I \cdot M \otimes V = 0$, where $I := \prod_{\mu \in \Lambda(V)} \operatorname{Ker}\chi_{\lambda+\mu}$.*

Proof. We shall prove 2.5 only for the case that q is generic. The general case can be deduced from this, using a continuity argument and integral forms of U_q, I and V, but we have omitted the details. Its enough to prove that

$$I \cdot \mathrm{U}_q^\lambda \otimes V = 0. \tag{2.5}$$

Using a suitable $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{b})^{\mathrm{int}}$-filtration on V with 1-dimensional subquotients a standard argument shows that

$$I \cdot M_\lambda \otimes V = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

By the quantum Duflo theorem we have that M_λ is a faithful representation of U_q^λ. Thus we are in the position to rerun the argument from the proof of the enveloping algebra case, Theorem 3.5 in [BerGel81], to deduce that 2.6 implies 2.5 in this case. □

3. Parabolic quantum flag manifold

In [BK06] a quantum flag manifold, or more precisely the category of quasi-coherent sheaves on it, was defined. Here we use the same method to quantize a parabolic flag manifold.

3.1. Definition of the parabolic quantum flag manifold.

3.1.1. Let $\triangle$ be the comultiplication on $\mathcal{O}_q$. The composition

$$\mathcal{O}_q \overset{\triangle}{\to} \mathcal{O}_q \otimes \mathcal{O}_q \to \mathcal{O}_q(P) \otimes \mathcal{O}_q \tag{3.1}$$

defines a left $\mathcal{O}_q(P)$-comodule structure on $\mathcal{O}_q$.

A P_q-equivariant sheaf on G_q is a triple (F, α, β) where F is a vector space, $\alpha : \mathcal{O}_q \otimes F \to F$ a left $\mathcal{O}_q$-module action and $\beta : F \to \mathcal{O}_q(P) \otimes F$ a left $\mathcal{O}_q(P)$-comodule action such that α is a left comodule map, where we consider the diagonal comodule structure on $\mathcal{O}_q \otimes F$. Morphisms of P_q-equivariant sheaves on G_q are $\mathcal{O}_q$-linear and P_q-linear maps.

Definition 3.1. We denote by $(\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod the category of P_q-equivariant sheaves on G_q.

We shall refer to objects of $(\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod as $(\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-modules. Classically, let $\mathcal{P} = G/P$ be the parabolic flag manifold. There is an equivalence $(\mathcal{O}(G), P)$-mod $\cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}$-mod, where $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}$-mod is the category of quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathcal{P}$. For this reason we like to think of objects of $(\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod as "(quasi-coherent) sheaves on $\mathcal{P}_q$".

3.2. Vector bundles and line bundles.

3.2.1. Let V be a finite dimensional P_q-module. Then we have

$$\mathcal{O}_q \otimes V \in (\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)\text{-mod}$$

where P_q acts (i.e. $\mathcal{O}_q(P)$ coacts) diagonally and $\mathcal{O}_q$ acts on the first factor. Since $\mathcal{O}_q$ is a G_q-P_q-bimodule (i.e. an $\mathcal{O}_q(P)$-$\mathcal{O}_q$-bicomodule) we see that $\mathcal{O}_q \otimes V$ comes with a left G_q-action as well. We can think of $\mathcal{O}_q \otimes V$ as a G_q-equivariant vector bundle on $(\mathcal{P})_q$.

When λ is a P_q-character (in which case also $-\lambda$ is a P_q-character) we put $\mathbb{C}_\lambda := V_{P_q}(\lambda)$ for the corresponding one-dimensional representation and we denote by

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_q}(\lambda) := \mathcal{O}_q \otimes \mathbb{C}_{-\lambda} \in (\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)\text{-mod}$$

the corresponding line bundle on $\mathcal{P}_q$. We shall also use the notation

$$M(\lambda) := M \otimes \mathbb{C}_{-\lambda} \in (\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)\text{-mod},$$

for $M \in (\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod and λ a P_q-character.

3.3. **Global sections, direct and inverse image.**

3.3.1. There is the *global section functor*

$$\Gamma : (\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)\text{-mod} \to \mathbb{C}\text{-mod},\ M \mapsto M^{P_q},\ M \in (\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)\text{-mod}.$$

Let $Q \supseteq P$ be another parabolic subgroup of G (actually, in this section we don't need that Q and P are parabolic). Let $\mathcal{Q} = G/Q$ and think of a symbolic map $\pi_q : \mathcal{P}_q \to \mathcal{Q}_q$ as a "quantization" of the projection $\pi : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{Q}$. Recall that we have the adjoint pair $Res^{P_q}_{Q_q} : Q_q\text{-mod} \rightleftarrows P_q\text{-mod} : Ind^{Q_q}_{P_q}$. It induces an adjoint pair of functors

$$\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q*}_{\mathcal{P}q} : (\mathcal{O}_q, Q_q)\text{-mod} \rightleftarrows (\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)\text{-mod} : \pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q*}. \tag{3.2}$$

Here, $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q*}_{\mathcal{P}q} M = Res^{P_q}_{Q_q} M$ as a P_q-module and the $\mathcal{O}_q$-module structure is the given by that on M, for $M \in (\mathcal{O}_q, Q_q)$-mod.

Similarly, $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q*} M = Ind^{Q_q}_{P_q} M$ as a Q_q-module and its $\mathcal{O}_q$-module structure is as follows:

Let $\triangle' : \mathcal{O}_q \to \mathcal{O}_q(Q) \otimes \mathcal{O}_q$ be the left coaction of $\mathcal{O}_q(Q)$ on $\mathcal{O}_q$ that is obtained by integrating the action μ_r of $\mathrm{U}_q(Lie\, Q)$ on $\mathcal{O}_q$. Let $f \otimes m \in \pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q*} M$ and let $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_q$. Write $\triangle'\alpha = \alpha_1 \otimes \alpha_2$. Then we have $\alpha \cdot (f \otimes m) = \alpha_1 f \otimes \alpha_2 m$.

We have that $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q*}_{\mathcal{P}q}$ is exact and $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q*}$ is right adjoint to $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q*}_{\mathcal{P}q}$; thus $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q*}$ is left exact and maps injectives to injectives. Let

$$\Theta : (\mathcal{O}_q, G_q)\text{-mod} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}\text{-mod},\ V \mapsto V^G,$$

be the canonical equivalence. There is a natural equivalence of functors $\Theta \circ \pi^{\mathcal{G}q}_{\mathcal{P}q*} \cong \Gamma$.

Lemma 3.2. *$(\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod has enough injectives, hence the derived functors $R\Gamma$ and $R\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q*}$ are well-defined.*

Proof. Let $p : G \to \mathcal{P}$ be the projection, let $M \in (\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod and let $p^*_q M \to I$ be an injection of $p^*_q M$ into an injective object $I \in \mathcal{O}_q$-mod. Then $p_{q*} I$ is injective and we get an injective composition

$$M \to p_{q*} p^*_q M \to p_{q*} I.$$

□

Note that $R\pi^{\mathcal{Q}'q}_{\mathcal{Q}q*} \circ R\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q*} = R\pi^{\mathcal{Q}'q}_{\mathcal{P}q*}$, for $Q' \supseteq Q$ a third parabolic, since $R\pi_{q*}$ maps injectives to injectives.

3.4. **Ampleness of line bundles on $\mathcal{P}_q$.**

3.4.1. Let $\lambda \in T_\Lambda$ and fix P. We let $\lambda >> 0$ mean that λ is a P_q-character and $\lambda(H_\alpha) >> 0$ for each $\alpha \in \Delta - \Delta_P$. Our result here is

Proposition 3.3. *We have*

1. *$R^{>0}\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_q}(\lambda)) = 0$, for $\lambda \in \Lambda_+$ a P_q-character.*
2. *The global section functor Γ on $(\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod has finite cohomological dimension.*
3. *Each object in $(\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod is a quotient of a direct sum of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_q}(\lambda)$'s.*
4. *Any surjection $M \twoheadrightarrow M'$ of noetherian (i.e. $\mathcal{O}_q$-coherent) objects in $(\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod induces a surjection $\Gamma(M(\lambda)) \twoheadrightarrow \Gamma(M'(\lambda))$ for $\lambda >> 0$.*
5. *If $M \in (\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod is noetherian, then $R^{>0}\Gamma(M(\lambda)) = 0$ for $\lambda >> 0$.*

Proof. The case $P = B$ was dealt with in [BK06]. We shall reduce to that case.

(1) Let $\lambda \in \Lambda_+$ be a P_q-character. We must prove that $R^{>0}\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_q}(\lambda)) = 0$. By the tensor identity we have $R\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_q}(\lambda)) = \mathcal{O}_q \otimes RInd^{G_q}_{P_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda})$; hence, it is enough to prove the *Kempf vanishing*

$$R^{>0}Ind^{G_q}_{P_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda}) = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

By [APW91], 3.3 holds for $P = B$ (and any $\lambda \in \Lambda_+$). Thus we have

$$Ind^{G_q}_{B_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda}) = RInd^{G_q}_{B_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda}) = RInd^{G_q}_{P_q} \circ RInd^{P_q}_{B_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda}).$$

Now, $RInd^{P_q}_{B_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda}) = RInd^{L_q}_{(L\cap B)_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda})$, with trivial $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$-action on the latter. Since $L\cap B$ is a Borel subgroup of the reductive group L, [APW91] applies again, so we get $RInd^{P_q}_{B_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda}) = Ind^{P_q}_{B_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda})$. Since $\lambda = 0$ on Δ_P it is clear that $Ind^{P_q}_{B_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda}) = \mathbb{C}_{-\lambda}$. Thus,

$$RInd^{G_q}_{P_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda}) = Ind^{G_q}_{B_q}(\mathbb{C}_{-\lambda}).$$

Thus 3.3 holds and 1) is proved.

(2) Let $M \in (\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod. Then we have from the tensor identity and the result of (1) applied to $\mathbb{C}_0$ that

$$RInd^{P_q}_{B_q}(M) = M \otimes RInd^{P_q}_{B_q}(\mathbb{C}_0) = M.$$

Thus

$$RInd^{G_q}_{B_q}(M) = RInd^{G_q}_{P_q} \circ RInd^{P_q}_{B_q}(M) = RInd^{G_q}_{P_q}(M),$$

which proves that $RInd^{G_q}_{P_q}$ has finite cohomological dimension, since we know from [APW91] that $RInd^{G_q}_{B_q}$ has cohomological dimension $\leq \dim \mathcal{B}$.

$(3), (4)$ and (5) can now formally be deduced from $(1), (2)$ and Lemma 3.2 by the same arguments as those in [BK06]. □

Remark 3.4. Using the multi-graded version, Proposition 2.1, in [BK06], of a theorem of Artin and Zhang about non-commutative projective schemes one can deduce that $(\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)$-mod $\cong$ $\mathbf{Proj}(A_q)$, where A_q is the ring $\oplus_{\lambda \in P-characters}\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}q}(\lambda))$.

4. Modules over extended quantum differential operators

We define some algebras of quantum differential operators on G_q and then we define categories of quantum $\mathcal{D}$-modules on $\mathcal{P}_q$.

4.1. **Algebras of differential operators on G_q.**

4.1.1. The construction given here is a version of the Heisenberg double, see [M93]. Recall the actions μ_l and μ_r of U_q on $\mathcal{O}_q$ from 2.1, the left and right adjoints action ad_l and ad_r of U_q on itself. In [BK06] we defined the ring of differential operators $\mathcal{D}_q$ on G_q to be the smash product $\mathcal{D}_q := \mathcal{O}_q \# \mathrm{U}_q$ with respect to the action μ_l.

Both the algebras $\mathcal{O}_q \otimes \mathrm{U}_q$ and $\mathcal{D}_q$ are right U_q-module algebras with respect to the action μ_r on $\mathcal{O}_q$ and the action ad_r on U_q. We shall refer to these actions as the right adjoint actions of U_q on $\mathcal{O}_q \otimes \mathrm{U}_q$ and on $\mathcal{D}_q$, respectively, and denote them by ad_r.

The algebra $\mathcal{D}_q$ is suitable in relation to equivariant sheaves of differential operators on $\mathcal{B}_q$, but it turns out that for each parabolic P it is better to use a different version of it (see Remark 4.4). Since $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$ is a left coideal in U_q we can define subalgebras of $\mathcal{D}_q$ by

Definition 4.1. Let $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} = \mathcal{O}_q \# \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$.

Observe that this coincide with our earlier definition: $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} = ad_r(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))$-integrable part of $\mathcal{D}_q$. Note that $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} = \mathcal{D}_q \iff \mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{h}$. We write $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathrm{int}} = \mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{g}\text{-int}}$. $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$ is a U_q-submodule algebra of $\mathcal{D}_q$.

The action $ad_r|_{\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}}$ integrates to an action

$$coad : \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} \to \mathcal{O}_q \otimes \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} .$$

This makes $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$ an $\mathcal{O}_q$-comodule algebra, i.e. *coad* is an algebra homomorphism. From the tensor identity we have $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} \cong coad(\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}) = (\mathcal{O}_q \otimes \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}})^{G_q}$. *coad* is however not the embedding that we are primary interested in. We have

Lemma 4.2. *There is an injective algebra homomorphism $\epsilon_l : (\mathrm{U}_q^{int})^{op} \to \mathcal{D}_q^{int}$ whose image is the space of right G_q-invariants $(\mathcal{D}_q^{int})^{G_q}$.*[1]

Proof. Let $\mathrm{U}_{q,\mathrm{left}}^{\mathrm{int}}$ be the integrable part for the left adjoint action. We have the algebra homomorphism $S : (\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}})^{op} \to \mathrm{U}_{q,\mathrm{left}}^{\mathrm{int}}$. Let ϵ_l' be defined as the composition

$$\mathrm{U}_{q,\mathrm{left}}^{\mathrm{int}} \overset{coad}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{O}_q \otimes \mathrm{U}_{q,\mathrm{left}}^{\mathrm{int}} \overset{1\otimes S^{-1}}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{O}_q \otimes \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} \overset{as\ sets}{=} \mathcal{D}_q^{\mathrm{int}}.$$

Put $\epsilon_l = S \circ \epsilon_l'$. It follows from [M93] that ϵ_l is an algebra embedding. □

Observe that the ϵ_l does *not* extend to an embedding $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \to \mathcal{D}_q$, unless $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{g}$.

There is also the left adjoint action of U_q on $\mathcal{D}_q$. This action commutes with the right adjoint action and is defined by taking the action μ_l on $\mathcal{O}_q$ and the trivial U_q-action on itself. We denote this action by ad_l. It integrates to a G_q-action. It restricts to a G_q-action on $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$. We get the embedding

$$\epsilon_r : \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \cong 1 \# \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}.$$

---

[1] Recall that in classical Lie theory differentiating the *left* action of G on itself gives an embedding of the enveloping algebra $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ into *right* invariant differential operators on G.

Thus $\epsilon_r(\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}) = {}^{G_q}\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$, equal the space of invariants for the left adjoint G_q-action. Note that $\mathcal{Z}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})) \subseteq \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$ so that $\epsilon_r(\mathcal{Z}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))) \subset \mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$.

4.2. **Definition of quantum $\mathcal{D}$-modules on $\mathcal{P}_q$.**

4.2.1.

Definition 4.3. Let $(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$-mod be the category whose object M satisfies
(1) M is a left $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$-module.
(2) M has a right P_q-action ρ such that $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \otimes M \to M$ is $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$-linear.
(3) $d\rho(x)m = \epsilon_r(x)m$, for $x \in \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$, $m \in M$.

The $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$-linearity in *ii)* means with respect to the action $d\rho$ on M and the right $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$-action on $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \otimes M$ given by $(y \otimes m)\cdot x = ad_r(x_2)(y) \otimes d\rho(x_1)(m)$, for $y \otimes m \in \mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \otimes M$ and $x \in \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$. Morphisms are $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$-linear and P_q-linear maps. We define the global section functor Γ on this category to be the functor of taking P_q-invariants. Recall the P_q-universal Verma module $\widetilde{M}_{P_q}$ from Section 2.7. Let

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q} := \mathcal{O}_q \otimes \epsilon_r(\widetilde{M}_{P_q}) \in (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))\text{-mod}.$$

Observe that $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q}$ represents the global section functor on this category.

Remarks 4.4. A) It is enough to verify condition (3) on a set of $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$-module generators of M. The reason for this is that $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$ is a left coideal. Indeed, if $m \in M$ satisfy $d\rho(x)m = \epsilon_r(x)m$ for all $x \in \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$, then for $y \in \mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$ we also have

$$(ym)\cdot x = ad_r(x_2)(y)d\rho(x_1)m = ad_r(x_2)(y)\epsilon_r(x_1)m = \epsilon_r(x)(ym)$$

since $x_1 \in \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$. This implies that any object satisfying (1) and (2) has a maximal subobject and a maximal quotient object that satisfy $(1)-(3)$.

B) The reason why we work with $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})$-integrable differential operators, rather than U_q-integrable ones, is the existence of the parabolic triangular decomposition of Corollary 6.4, which is crucial to understand the structure of $\widetilde{M}_{P_q}$ and hence that of $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q}$. .

Thus, by Remark 6.5 C), we must in the case $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{b}$ use the full algebra $\mathcal{D}_q$. Then the $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})$-integrability conditions are naturally imposed since we want Theorem 4.1 to hold.

4.2.2. *Action of* $\mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))$ *on* $(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$*-mod.* Consider now the smash product algebra $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \# \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\text{int}}$. Note that any $M \in (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$-mod has a natural left $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \# \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\text{int}}$-action (the $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$-action is the given one and the $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\text{int}}$-action is given by $d\rho|_{\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\text{int}}}$).

By Lemma 6.1 and Corollary 6.2 we have

Proposition 4.5. *There is an algebra homomorphism*

$$\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}} : \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{int} \to \mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int} \# \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{int},\ \widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}}(u) = S(u_1) \otimes u_2, u \in \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{int}.$$

$\mathrm{Im}\,\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}}$ *commutes with* $\mathcal{D}_q \otimes 1$*,* $\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}}$ *induces an algebra isomorphism*

$$1_{\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int}} \otimes \widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}} : \mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int} \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{int} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int} \# \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{int}$$

and $\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}}$ *restricts to an embedding*

$$\alpha_{\mathfrak{l}} := \widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}}|_{\mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))} : \mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})) = \mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{int}) \to \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int} \# \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{int}).$$

Note that if q is generic then $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}) = \mathbb{C}$ and $\alpha_{\mathfrak{l}}$ is an isomorphism.

Definition 4.6. Let $\lambda \in T_\Lambda$ and let $(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda})$-mod be the category whose object M satisfies $(1)-(3)$ and also

(4) $(\alpha_{\mathfrak{l}}(z) - \chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda}(z))m = 0,\ m \in M, z \in \mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))$.

Similarly, we let $(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \widehat{\chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda}})$-mod be the category whose object M satisfies $(1)-(3)$ and also

$\widehat{(4)}$ $\alpha_{\mathfrak{l}}(z) - \chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda}(z)$ is locally nilpotent on M, for $z \in \mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))$.

Again, the global section functor Γ on $(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda})$-mod is defined to be the functor of taking P_q-invariants. Note that the object

$$\mathcal{D}^\lambda_{\mathcal{P}_q} := \mathcal{O}_q \otimes \epsilon_r(M_{P_q,\lambda}) \in (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda})\text{-mod}$$

represents global sections on this category.

4.2.3. Note that if $M \in (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$-mod and V is a P_q-module such that if we differentiate the P_q-action $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}) \subset \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$ acts trivially on V, then we naturally have $M \otimes V \in (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$-mod, by letting P_q act diagonally and $\mathcal{D}_q$ on the first factor. We get

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\lambda \in T_\Lambda$, $M \in (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda})$-mod and let $V_{P_q}(\mu)$ be an irreducible P_q-module with highest weight μ. Then $M \otimes V_{P_q}(\mu) \in \oplus_{\nu\in\Lambda(V_P(\mu))}(\mathcal{D}_q, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \widehat{\chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda+\nu}})$-mod, where $\Lambda(V_{P_q}(\mu))$ denotes the set of weights of $V_{P_q}(\mu)$.*

Proof. We know that any object of $(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$-mod has a natural action of $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \# \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\text{int}}$ and hence also of $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\text{int}}$ via the map $\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}}$ of Proposition 4.5. Let us refer to this $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\text{int}}$-action as the $\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}}$-action.

We observe that the $\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}}$-action on $M \otimes V_{P_q}(\mu)$ is the diagonal action of the $\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}}$-action on M and the given $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\text{int}}$-action on $V_{P_q}(\mu)$, which is obtained by differentiating the given L_q-action. We have by assumption that $\alpha_{\mathfrak{l}}(z) = \widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{l}}(z)$ acts by $\chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda}(z)$ on M, for $z \in \mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))$. Therefore the assertion of the lemma follows from Lemma 2.9. □

4.3. **Direct and inverse image of $\mathcal{D}_q$-modules.**

4.3.1. For $P \subseteq Q$ parabolics recall that we have the adjoint pair $(\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q*}_{\mathcal{P}q}, \pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q*})$ at the level of equivariant $\mathcal{O}_q$-modules (see Section 3.3). We shall now construct direct and inverse image functors between our $\mathcal{D}_q$-module categories.

Let L' and R' be the Levi and the unipotent radical of Q and let $\mathfrak{l}'$ and $\mathfrak{r}'$ be their respective Lie algebras. Let $\mathfrak{q}$ be the Lie algebra of Q.

We shall construct a direct image functor

$$\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q\bullet} : (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))\text{-mod} \to (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-int}}, Q_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}'))\text{-mod}$$

Let $M \in (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$-mod. We define the underlying $(\mathcal{O}_q, Q_q)$-module of $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q\bullet}M$ to be $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q*}M = Ind^{Q_q}_{P_q}M$. It remains to construct an action of $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-int}}$ on $Ind^{Q_q}_{P_q}M$ satisfying certain compatibilities.

Let for now $\triangle : \mathrm{U}_q^{\text{int}} \to \mathcal{O}_q(Q) \otimes \mathrm{U}_q^{\text{int}}$ denote the left coadjoint action of $\mathcal{O}_q(Q)$ on $\mathrm{U}_q^{\text{int}}$ (i.e. the coaction obtained by integrating the action ad_r of $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{q})$ on $\mathrm{U}_q^{\text{int}}$). Since $\triangle$ makes

$\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$ an $\mathcal{O}_q(Q)$-comodule algebra we have that $\triangle$ is an algebra homomorphism. By the tensor identity $\triangle$ maps $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$ isomorphically onto the subspace $Ind_{P_q}^{Q_q}\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} \subset \mathcal{O}_q(Q)\otimes \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$.

Moreover, the tensor identity provides an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} \otimes Ind_{P_q}^{Q_q} M \to Ind_{P_q}^{Q_q}\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} \otimes M$$

given by $u\otimes(a\otimes m)\mapsto u_1 a\otimes u_2\otimes m$, for $a\otimes m\in Ind_{P_q}^{Q_q}M$ and $u\in \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$, $\triangle u = u_1\otimes u_2$. Composing this isomorphism with the map $Ind_{P_q}^{Q_q}\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}\otimes M\to Ind_{P_q}^{Q_q}M$, that is given by the action map $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}\otimes M\to M$, we get a map

$$\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}} \otimes Ind_{P_q}^{Q_q} M \to Ind_{P_q}^{Q_q} M,\ u\otimes(a\otimes m)\mapsto u_1 a\otimes u_2 m. \tag{4.1}$$

This gives a $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$-module structure on $Ind_{P_q}^{Q_q}M$, since $\triangle$ is an algebra map.

Proposition 4.8. *$\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q\bullet}$ defines a functor $(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$-mod $\to (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-}int}, Q_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}'))$-mod.*

Proof. Let $M\in(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$-mod. The $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$-action on $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q\bullet}M$ is compatible with the $\mathcal{O}_q$-action so that $Ind_{P_q}^{Q_q}M$ becomes a $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$-module. Moreover, this $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$-action is Q_q-equivariant. In order to make $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q\bullet}M$ a $\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-int}}$-module we shall use that 2.4 provides us with a Q_q-linear isomorphism:

$$\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q\bullet}M \cong Ind^{L'_q}_{(P\cap L')_q}M.$$

We transport the $\mathcal{O}_q$-action to the RHS making $Ind^{L'_q}_{(P\cap L')_q}M$ an object of $(\mathcal{O}_q, Q_q)$-mod. In analogy with the above we can equip $Ind^{L'_q}_{(P\cap L')_q}M$ with an $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-int}}$-structure by the composition

$$\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-int}}\otimes Ind^{L'_q}_{(P\cap L')_q}M \cong Ind^{L'_q}_{(P\cap L')_q}\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-int}}\otimes M \to Ind^{L'_q}_{(P\cap L')_q}M$$

where the first isomorphism is the tensor identity and the second map is induced from the action map $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-int}}\otimes M\to M$. (This extends the $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathrm{int}}$-action previously defined.) Again, this $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-int}}$-action is compatible with the $\mathcal{O}_q$ and Q_q-actions making $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q\bullet}M\cong Ind^{L'_q}_{(P\cap L')_q}M$ an object of $(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-int}}, Q_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}'))$-mod. □

Define a functor

$$\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q\bullet}_{\mathcal{P}q} : (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-int}}, Q_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}'))\text{-mod} \to (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))\text{-mod} \tag{4.2}$$

by $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q\bullet}_{\mathcal{P}q}(V)$:= maximal $(\mathcal{D}_q, P_q)$-module quotient of V on which the two actions of $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$ coincide. The P_q-action on $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q\bullet}_{\mathcal{P}q}(V)$ is by definition the restriction of the Q_q-action.

We observe that the forgetful functor $for : (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$-mod $\to \mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$-mod has a right adjoint. From this it follows that $(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$-mod has enough injectives. It is straightforward to verify that

Proposition 4.9. *The functor $\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q\bullet}_{\mathcal{P}q}$ is right exact. There is an adjoint pair of functors*

$$\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q\bullet}_{\mathcal{P}q} : (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-}int}, Q_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}'))\text{-}mod \rightleftarrows (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))\text{-}mod : \pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q\bullet}.$$

Note that the forgetful functors

$$(\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))\text{-mod} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{O}_q, P_q)\text{-mod} \longrightarrow P_q\text{-mod}$$

map injectives to injectives. Thus the derived functors $R\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q\bullet}$ can be computed as $RInd^{Q_q}_{P_q}$ of underlying P_q-modules.

4.4. **Description of global sections.**

4.4.1. We keep the notations of Section 4.3. The main result of this section is

Theorem 4.1. *For any $q \in \mathbb{C}^*$ except roots of unity of order smaller than the Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}$ we have i) $R\pi^{\mathcal{P}q}_{\mathcal{B}q\bullet}\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{B}_q} = \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda$, ii) $R\pi^{\mathcal{Q}q}_{\mathcal{P}q\bullet}(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{Q}_q} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_Q}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}$, iii) $R\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q}) = \mathrm{U}_q^{int} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}$ and iv) $R\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q}) \cong \widetilde{U}_q$.*

Part *iv*) of this theorem, for the case $P = B$, was first proved in [BK06, BK08]. A new proof of *iii*) and *iv*) in the case $P = B$ is given in [BK11]. The idea here is to reduce to that case. Because of our usual equivalence $\mathbb{C}$-mod $\cong (\mathcal{O}_q, G_q)$-mod we see that a special case of *iii*) implies that *i*) holds when $P = G$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Step a) We have $\pi^{\mathcal{P}q\bullet}_{\mathcal{B}q}\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q} = \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{B}_q}$. By adjunction this give a morhism

$$\phi_{B_q,P_q} : \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q} \to R\pi^{\mathcal{P}q}_{\mathcal{B}q\bullet}\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{B}_q}.$$

The embedding $\mathbb{C}\Lambda \to \widetilde{M}_{B_q}$ induces a map $\alpha : \mathbb{C}\Lambda \to R\pi^{\mathcal{P}q}_{\mathcal{B}q\bullet}\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{B}_q}$. We observe that $\alpha|_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}}$ coincides with the composition

$$\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P} \xrightarrow{\chi^{-1}_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda}} \mathcal{Z}^{HC}(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \overset{\epsilon_r}{\to} \mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q} \overset{\phi_{B_q,P_q}}{\to} R\pi^{\mathcal{P}q}_{\mathcal{B}q\bullet}\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{B}_q}.$$

We thus get a map

$$\phi_{B_q,P_q} \otimes \alpha : \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda \to R\pi^{\mathcal{P}q}_{\mathcal{B}q\bullet}\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{B}_q}.$$

By the tensor identity and lemma 2.4 we have

$$R\pi^{\mathcal{P}q}_{\mathcal{B}q\bullet}\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{B}_q} \cong \mathcal{O}_q(P) \otimes RInd^{P_q}_{B_q}\widetilde{M}_{B_q} \cong \mathcal{O}_q(P) \otimes RInd^{L_q}_{(B\cap L)_q}\widetilde{M}_{B_q}.$$

Therefore, $\phi_{B_q,P_q} = 1_{\mathcal{O}_q(P)} \otimes \overline{\phi}_{B_q,P_q}$ where

$$\overline{\phi}_{B_q,P_q} : \widetilde{M}_{P_q} \to RInd^{L_q}_{(B\cap L)_q}\widetilde{M}_{B_q}$$

is given by $\overline{\phi}_{B_q,P_q}(m) = a_1 \otimes \overline{m}_2$, where $\Delta m = a_1 \otimes m_2 \in \mathcal{O}_q(L) \otimes \widetilde{M}_{P_q}$ is the coaction and $\overline{m}_2$ is the image of m_2 in $\widetilde{M}_{B_q}$. There is also a natural map $\overline{\alpha} : \mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P} \to \widetilde{M}_{P_q}$ (obtained by restricting the image of α). Thus, again, we get a map

$$\overline{\phi}_{B_q,P_q} \otimes \overline{\alpha} : \widetilde{M}_{P_q} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda \to RInd^{L_q}_{(B\cap L)_q}\widetilde{M}_{B_q}. \tag{4.3}$$

Recall that by [BK11] $\overline{\phi}_{B_q,G_q} \otimes \overline{\alpha}$ is an isomorphisms for all q (except roots of unity of order smaller than the Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}$).

Step b) By corollary 6.4 we have the isomorphisms $(*)$ $\mathrm{U}_q(\overline{\mathfrak{r}}) \otimes \widetilde{M}_{L_q} \overset{\sim}{\to} \widetilde{M}_{P_q}$ and $(**)$ $\mathrm{U}_q(\overline{\mathfrak{r}}) \otimes \widetilde{M}_{(B\cap L)_q} \overset{\sim}{\to} \widetilde{M}_{B_q}$, where $\widetilde{M}_{(B\cap L)_q} := \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}) \otimes_{\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}\cap\mathfrak{n})} \mathbb{C}$ is the universal Verma module for $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})$.

Under the isomorphisms $(*)$ and $(**)$ we see that the map $\overline{\phi}_{B_q,P_q} \otimes \overline{\alpha}$ corresponds to

$$f : \mathrm{U}_q(\overline{\mathfrak{r}}) \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda \to RInd^{L_q}_{(B\cap L)_q}\mathrm{U}_q(\overline{\mathfrak{r}}) \otimes \widetilde{M}_{(B\cap L)_q},$$

where $f(x \otimes v \otimes z) = x_1 v_1 \otimes x_2 \otimes \overline{v_2} \cdot \overline{\alpha}(z)$, where $v \mapsto \overline{v}$ is the natural projection $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\mathrm{int}} \to \widetilde{M}_{(B\cap L)_q}$.

Again, (by [BK11]) the map $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\mathrm{int}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda \to RInd_{(B\cap L)_q}^{L_q} \widetilde{M}_{(B\cap L)_q}$ given by $v \otimes z \mapsto v_1 \otimes \overline{v_2} \cdot \overline{\alpha}(z)$ is an isomorphism. Thus also f is an isomorphism by the tensor identity. Thus $\phi_{B_q,P_q} \otimes \overline{\alpha}$ is an isomorphism. This proves *i*).

Step c) Just like in *Step a)* we get a map

$$\overline{\phi}_{P_q,Q_q} : \widetilde{M}_{Q_q} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_Q}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P} \to RInd_{P_q}^{Q_q} \widetilde{M}_{P_q} \tag{4.4}$$

that we must prove is an isomorphism. We have $RInd_{B_q}^{P_q} \widetilde{M}_{B_q} = \widetilde{M}_{P_q} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda$, so that

$$(RInd_{P_q}^{Q_q} \widetilde{M}_{P_q}) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda = RInd_{P_q}^{Q_q} \widetilde{M}_{P_q} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda = RInd_{B_q}^{Q_q} \widetilde{M}_{B_q} = \widetilde{M}_{Q_q} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_Q}} \mathbb{C}\Lambda.$$

Since $\mathbb{C}\Lambda$ is faithfully flat over $\mathbb{C}\Lambda^{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_P}$ it follows that $\overline{\phi}_{P_q,Q_q}$ and hence ϕ_{P_q,Q_q} is an isomorphism. This shows *ii*). *iii*) follows from a special case of *ii*) by taking G_q-invariants. Finally, *iv*) is deduced from *iii*) by specializing to λ. □

4.4.2. *Localization functor.* Because of Theorem 4.1 the global section functor Γ takes values in certain categories of U_q-modules:

$$\Gamma : (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda})\text{-mod} \to \mathrm{U}_q^{\lambda}\text{-mod and}$$

$$\Gamma : (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \widehat{\chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda}})\text{-mod} \to \mathrm{U}_q\text{-mod}^{\widehat{\lambda}}.$$

It is easy to see that both functors have left adjoints, denoted by $\mathcal{L}$, which we call localization functors. In the first case it is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{P}_q}^{\lambda} \otimes_{\mathrm{U}_q^{\lambda}} (\;) : \mathrm{U}_q^{\lambda}\text{-mod} \to (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda})\text{-mod}$$

and in the second case it is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \varprojlim_n (\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{P}_q}/(1 \otimes \operatorname{Ker}\chi_\lambda)^n) \otimes_{\mathrm{U}_q} (\;) : \mathrm{U}_q\text{-mod}^{\widehat{\lambda}} \to (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \widehat{\chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda}})\text{-mod}.$$

5. Singular Localization

5.0.3. Here we prove the singular version of Beilinson-Bernstein localization.

Theorem 5.1. *Let q be generic and let λ be dominant and P-regular. Then*

$$\Gamma : (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda})\text{-}mod \to \mathrm{U}_q^{\lambda}\text{-}mod$$

is an equivalence of categories.

Proof. Essentially taken from [BB81]. Since $\Gamma(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{P}_q}^{\lambda}) = \mathrm{U}_q^{\lambda}$, which is a generator of the target category, the theorem will follow from the following two claims:

a) Let λ be dominant. Then $\Gamma : (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda})\text{-mod} \to \mathrm{U}_q^{\lambda}\text{-mod}$ is exact.

b) Let λ be dominant and P-regular and $M \in (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda})$-mod, then, if $\Gamma(M) = 0$, it follows that $M = 0$.

Let V be a finite dimensional irreducible G_q-module and let

$$0 = V_{-1} \subset V_0 \subset \ldots \subset V_n = V$$

be a filtration of V by P_q-submodules, such that $V_i/V_{i-1} \cong V_P(\mu_i)$ is an irreducible P_q-module. Recall that $M \otimes V \in (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}))$-mod.

Assume that the highest weight μ_0 of V is a P_q-character. Then $V_0 = V_{P_q}(\mu_0) = \mathbb{C}_{\mu_0}$ and we have $M \otimes V_0 = M(-\mu_0)$ (see Section 3.2 for these notations). Thus we get an embedding $M(-\mu_0) \hookrightarrow M \otimes V$, which twists to the embedding

$$M \hookrightarrow (M \otimes V)(\mu_0) \cong M^{\dim V}(\mu_0) = M(\mu_0)^{\dim V}.$$

Now, by Lemmas 2.2 i), 4.7 and Theorem 4.1 iii) we get that this inclusion splits on derived global sections, so $R\Gamma(M)$ is a direct summand of $R\Gamma(M(\mu_0))^{\dim V}$. Now, for μ_0 big enough and M $\mathcal{O}_q$-coherent we have $R^{>0}\Gamma(M(\mu_0)) = 0$, by Proposition 3.3. Hence, $R^{>0}\Gamma(M) = 0$ in this case. A general M is the union of coherent submodules and by a standard limit-argument it follows that $R^{>0}\Gamma(M) = 0$. This proves a).

Now, for b) we assume instead that the lowest weight μ_n of V is a P-character. Then we have a surjection $M^{\dim V} \cong M \otimes V \to M(-\mu_n)$. Applying global sections and using Lemmas 2.2 ii), 4.7 and Theorem 4.1 iv) we get that $\Gamma(M(-\mu_n))$ is a direct summand of $\Gamma(M)^{\dim V}$. For μ_n small enough we get that $\Gamma(M(-\mu_n)) \neq 0$. Hence, $\Gamma(M) \neq 0$. This proves b). □

Theorem 5.2. *Let q be generic and let λ be dominant and P-regular then*

$$\Gamma : (\mathcal{D}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int}, P_q, \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}), \widehat{\chi_{\mathfrak{l},\lambda}})\text{-}mod \to \mathrm{U}_q\text{ -}mod^{\widehat{\lambda}}$$

is an equivalence of categories.

Proof. This follows from Theorem 5.1 and a simple devissage. □

6. Appendix

6.1. Hopf algebras.

6.1.1. For general information we refer to [M93]. Let H be a Hopf algebra over a commutative ring. We denote by μ, $\triangle$, S, ι and ϵ the product, coproduct, antipode, unit and counit, respectively, on H. We shall use Sweedler's notation and write $\triangle x = x_1 \otimes x_2$ for the coproduct of $x \in H$.

If M is a right H-comodule we denote by $\triangle : M \to M \otimes H$ the coaction and write $\triangle m = m_1 \otimes x_2$, for $m \in M$. If N is another right H-comodule we have the *diagonal* coaction of H on $M \otimes N$ defined as the composition

$$M \otimes N \xrightarrow{\triangle\otimes\triangle} (M \otimes H) \otimes (N \otimes H) \xrightarrow{F_{23}} (M \otimes N) \otimes (H \otimes H) \xrightarrow{1\otimes\mu} (M \otimes N) \otimes H,$$

where F_{23} flips the 2'nd and 3'rd tensor.

Let R be an algebra equipped with a (left) H-module structure. R is called a *module algebra* for H if $x(r \cdot r') = x_1(r) \cdot x_2(r')$, for $x \in H$ and $r, r' \in R$. We can then define the *smash-product algebra* $R\#H$. As a vector space $R\#H = R \otimes H$ and its associative multiplication is defined by

$$r \otimes x \cdot r' \otimes x' = r x_1(r') \otimes x_2 x'.$$

6.1.2. *Adjoint action.* The left adjoint action ad_l of H on itself is given by $ad_l(x)(y) = x_1 y S(x_2)$. Similarly, there is the right adjoint action ad_r of H on itself which is defined by $ad_r(x)(y) = S(x_1) y x_2$. It makes R a right H-module algebra.

6.1.3. *An untwisting lemma.* Assume that H is isomorphic to a Hopf subalgebra of R and consider the action of H on R which is the restriction of the left adjoint action of R on itself. Then we have

Lemma 6.1. *There is an algebra homomorphism*

$$f : H \to R\#H,\ f(x) = S(x_1) \otimes x_2, x \in H.$$

Moreover, $\operatorname{Im} f$ *commutes with* $R\otimes 1$ *and* f *induces an algebra isomorphism* $1_R \otimes f : R\otimes H \overset{\sim}{\to} R\#H$*.*

Proof. For the first assertion, let $x, y \in H$. Then

$$f(x) \cdot f(y) = S(x_1) \otimes x_2 \cdot S(y_1) \otimes y_2 = S(x_1)ad_l(x_2)(S(y_1)) \otimes x_3y_2 =$$
$$S(x_1)ad_l(x_2)(S(y_1)) \otimes x_3y_2 = S(x_1)x_2S(y_1)S(x_3) \otimes x_4y_2 =$$
$$\iota \circ \epsilon(x_1)S(y_1)S(x_2) \otimes x_3y_2 = S(y_1)S(x_1) \otimes x_1x_2 = f(xy).$$

For the second assertion, let $r \otimes 1 \in R \otimes 1$ and $x \in H$. Then

$$f(x) \cdot r \otimes 1 = S(x_1)ad_l(x_2)(r) \otimes x_3 = S(x_1)x_2rS(x_3) \otimes x_4 =$$
$$\iota \circ \epsilon(x_1)rS(x_2) \otimes x_3 = rS(x_1) \otimes x_2 = r \otimes 1 \cdot f(x).$$

This implies that $1_R \otimes f$ is an algebra homomorphism; its inverse is given by

$$R\#H \ni r \otimes x \mapsto rx_1 \otimes x_2 \in R \otimes H.$$

□

Let $\mathcal{Z}(H)$ denote the center of (the underlying algebra of) H.

Corollary 6.2. f *induces an algebra embedding* $\overline{f} : \mathcal{Z}(H) \to \mathcal{Z}(R\#H)$*.* $1\otimes f$ *induces an isomorphism* $\mathcal{Z}(R) \otimes \mathcal{Z}(H) \overset{\sim}{\to} \mathcal{Z}(R\#H)$*. In particular, if* $\mathcal{Z}(R) = \mathbb{C}$ *then* $\overline{f}$ *is an isomorphism.*

6.2. **Quantizing** $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{r})$**.** A canonical quantization $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$ was defined in [G07]. The following properties of it was proved in [G07] for a generic q. We shall prove them for any q by modifying his methods.

Proposition-Definition 6.3. *There are subalgebras* $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}) \subseteq \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{b})$ *and* $\mathrm{U}_q(\overline{\mathfrak{r}}) \subseteq \mathrm{U}_q(\overline{\mathfrak{b}})$ *such that the following holds:*

i) *Multiplication define linear isomorphisms* $\mathrm{U}_q(\overline{\mathfrak{r}}) \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{U}_q(\overline{\mathfrak{p}})$, $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}) \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$ *and* $\mathrm{U}_q(\overline{\mathfrak{r}}) \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}) \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{U}_q$ *(parabolic triangular decomposition).*

ii) $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$ *and* $\mathrm{U}_q(\overline{\mathfrak{r}})$ *are integrable* $ad_r(\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}))$*-modules.*

iii) $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$ *is a left coideal in* $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{b})$*.*

iv) $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$ *specializes to* $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{r})$ *at* $q = 1$*.*

Proof. The Majid-Radford theorem, [Maj93, R85], implies the following: Let $\pi : H \to H_0$ be a split projection of Hopf algebras (i.e. there exists a Hopf algebra injection $\iota : H_0 \to H$ such that $\pi \circ \iota = Id$.) Put $B := B(H, H_0) = \{x \in H; \pi(x_1) \otimes x_2 = 1 \otimes x\}$. Then multiplication defines an isomorphism $H_0 \otimes B \xrightarrow{\sim} H$. Observe that B is automatically stable under the right adjoint action of H_0 on H and that B is a left coideal in H.

Note that if $H = \oplus_{n\in\mathbb{N}} H_n$ is an $\mathbb{N}$-graded Hopf algebra, then the projection $\pi : H \to H_0$ is split.

Assume that H and H_0 are Hopf algebras over $\mathcal{A}$. Then we see that the construction of B above commutes with every specialization $t \to q$. Because, if we let $B_q = B(H_q, H_{0,q})$ and

$B_{t\mapsto q} = B(H, H_0)_q$, we clearly have $B_{t\mapsto q} \subseteq B_q$ and, since $H_{0q} \otimes B_q = H_q = H_{0q} \otimes B_{t\mapsto q}$, we get $B_{t\mapsto q} = B_q$.

Let $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p})'$ be the subalgebra of $\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p})$ generated by $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p})$ and $\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l})$. Consider on $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p})$ (resp. on $\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p})'$) the grading for which $\deg \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}) = 0$ (resp. $\deg \mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l}) = 0$) and $\deg E_\beta = 1$, for $\beta \in \Delta \setminus \Delta_P$. Let $B := B(\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p}), \mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l}))$ and $B' := B(\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p})', \mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l}))$. Since

$$\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l}) \otimes B' = \mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l}) \otimes_{\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l})} \mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l}) \otimes_{\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l})} (\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l}) \otimes B) = \mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l}) \otimes B.$$

and, evidently, $B \subseteq B'$ we get $B = B'$. This implies that B is stable under the right adjoint action of $\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l})$. We shall next prove that this action is integrable:

Observe that $K_{-\beta}E_\beta \in B(\mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p}), \mathrm{U}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l}))$. We have (using the Serre relations) that

$$ad_r^{1-\langle\alpha,\beta\rangle}(E_\alpha)(K_{-\beta}E_\beta) = ad_r(F_\alpha)(K_{-\beta}E_\beta) = 0,\ \alpha \neq \beta \in \Delta.$$

This implies that $K_{-\beta}E_\beta \in \mathrm{U}^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}_{\mathcal{A}}$, for $\beta \in \Delta \setminus \Delta_P$. Then B is generated as an algebra by the $\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p})$-module generated by $K_{-\beta}E_\beta$, $\beta \in \Delta \setminus \Delta_P$. This follows from an induction similar to the one given in the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [G07]. We have omitted the details here.

Thus we have proved that $\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{l})$-module structure integrates to an $L_{\mathcal{A}}$-module structure on B. Putting $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}) := B_q$, we get that $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$ is an L_q-module for which the first isomorphism of *i*) holds. Similarly, we construct an L_q-module $\mathrm{U}_q(\bar{\mathfrak{r}}) \subset \mathrm{U}_q(\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ such that the second isomorphism of *i*) holds. The third isomorphism of *i*) follows from the first two.

ii) and *iii*) are already proved. By a computation we have $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{r}) = B(\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{p}), \mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{l}))$, which, together with the fact that B commutes with specializations, proves *iv*). □

It follows from the constructions that $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})$ and $\mathrm{U}_q(\bar{\mathfrak{r}})$ are Hopf-algebras in the braided tensor category of modules over the Drinfel'd double of $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})$. But they are not Hopf-subalgebras of $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{b})$, resp. of $\mathrm{U}_q(\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$, in the usual sense, i.e. they are not closed under the coproduct, not even for $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{n}$.

Corollary 6.4. *Multiplication define linear isomorphisms* $\mathrm{U}_q(\bar{\mathfrak{r}}) \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{int} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{U}_q(\bar{\mathfrak{p}})^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int}$, $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{int} \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int}$ *and* $\mathrm{U}_q(\bar{\mathfrak{r}}) \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{int} \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-}int}$.

Proof. Let us prove the third isomorphism, the others are similar. Note that by *i*) and *ii*) of Proposition-Definition 6.3 we see that multiplication defines an embedding $\mathrm{U}_q(\bar{\mathfrak{r}}) \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\mathrm{int}} \otimes \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r}) \to \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$. We must show it is surjective.

Let $v \in \mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}\text{-int}}$. We can decompose $v = \sum x_i \otimes y_j \otimes z_k$ according to the isomorphism of Proposition-Definition 6.3 *ii*) where we can assume that the x_i's y_j's and z_k's are linearly independent weight vectors. We must show that each $y_j \in \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\mathrm{int}}$.

Assume in order to get a contradiction that there is a j_0 such that $y_{j_0} \in \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l}) \setminus \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{l})^{\mathrm{int}}$. Thus there is WLOG an $E = E_\alpha$ such that $ad_E := ad_r(E)$ is not locally finite on y_{j_0}; this implies that for all $s \geq 1$ we have

$$(*) \qquad ad_E^s(y_{j_0}) \notin \mathrm{Span}\{ad_E^t(y_{j_0}); t < s\}.$$

We claim that this implies that ad_E is not locally finite on v. By subtracting all summands $x_i \otimes y_j \otimes z_k$ for which ad_E is locally finite on y_j we can assume that ad_E is not locally finite on any y_j and hence we can assume that there is a vector $x_{i_0} \otimes y_{j_0} \otimes z_{k_0}$ such that x_{i_0} has lowest weight among all the x_i's. But then $ad_E^s(v)$ contains a term $K^{-s}x_{i_0} \otimes E^s y_{j_0} \otimes z_{i_0}$, where $K = K_\alpha$, which by $(*)$ isn't cancelled by the other terms. This gives the desired contradiction. □

Remarks 6.5. A) It follows from the proof of Proposition-Definition 6.3 that the case $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{r}$ gives $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{n}) \overset{def}{=} \mathbb{C}\langle K_{-\alpha}E_\alpha; \alpha \in \Delta\rangle$. This definition is not the standard one: usually one takes $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{n})$ to be $\mathbb{C}\langle E_\alpha; \alpha \in \Delta\rangle$. It follows however from the Serre relations that our $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{n})$ is isomorphic to the latter algebra.

B) Observe that $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})_{>0}$ annihilates every finite dimensional irreducible representation of $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{p})$. Moreover, $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{b}) \cdot \mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{r})_{>0}$ is generated as a left $\mathrm{U}_q(\mathfrak{b})$-ideal by E_α and $E_\alpha E_\beta$, for $\alpha \in \Delta \setminus \Delta_P$ and $\beta \in \Delta_P$.

C) The result of Corollary 6.4 is optimal in the sense that it is impossible to construct a $\mathfrak{p}$-parabolic triangular decomposition of $\mathrm{U}_q^{\mathfrak{l}'\text{-fin}}$ for $\mathfrak{l}'$ a Levi such that $\mathfrak{l} \subsetneq \mathfrak{l}'$.

References

[APW91] H. H. Andersen, P. Polo and W. Kexin, *Representations of quantum algebras*, Invent. Math. 104, (1991) 1-59.

[AZ94] M. Artin and J.J. Zhang *Noncommutative projective schemes*, Adv. Math. 109, (1994), 228-287.

[BGG75] I. N. Bernstein, I. M. Gelfand, and S. I. Gelfand, *Differential operators on the base affine space and the study of g-modules, Lie Groups and their representations* (New York) (I. M. Gelfand, ed.), Halsted Press, 1975, pp. 2164.

[BK06] E. Backelin and K. Kremnizer, *Quantum flag varieties, equivariant D-modules and localization of quantum groups*, Adv in Math, Volume 203, Issue 2, (2006), 408-429.

[BK08] E. Backelin and K. Kremnizer, *Localization of a quantum group at a root of unity*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 21 (2008), 1001-1018.

[BK10] E. Backelin and K. Kremnizer, *On singular localization of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules*, http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/1011.0896

[BK11] E. Backelin and K. Kremnizer, *Global quantum differential operators on quantum flag manifolds, theorems of Duflo and Kostant*, http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/1106.4343

[B00] P. Baumann, *Another proof of Joseph and Letzter's separation of variables theorem for quantum groups*, Transformation groups, Vol 5, no 1, (2000), 3-20.

[BB81] A. Beilinson and J. Bernstein, *Localisation de $\mathfrak{g}$-modules*, C. R. Acad. Sc. Paris, 292 (Série I) (1981) 15-18.

[BerGel81] J. Bernstein and S.I. Gelfand, *Tensor products of finite and infinite dimensional representations of semisimple Lie algebras*, Comp. Math. 41 (1981), 245–285.

[BMR08] R. Bezrukavnikov, I. Mircovic and D. Rumynin, *Localization for a semi-simple Lie algebra in prime characteristic*, Ann. of Math. (2) (2008), no. 3, 945-991.

[BMR06] R. Bezrukavnikov, I. Mircovic and D. Rumynin, *Singular localization and intertwining operators for Lie algebras in prime characteristic*, Nagoya Math. J. 184 (2006), 1-55.

[BM10] R. Bezrukavnikov and I. Mircovic, *Representations of semi-simple Lie algebras in prime characteristic and non-commutative Springer resolution*, (2010), arXiv:1001.2562v6.

[CP95] W. Chari and A. Pressley, *A guide to quantum groups*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 53, (1995).

[DL] C. De Concini and V. Lyubashenko, *Quantum function algebras at roots of* 1, Adv. in Math. 108, (1994) 205-262.

[G07] Jan E. Grabowski, *Braided enveloping algebras associated to quantum parabolic subalgebras*, http://arxiv.org/abs/0706.0455v3 .

[HTT08] R. Hotta, K. Takeuchi and T. Tanisaki, *D-Modules, Perverse Sheaves and Representation Theory*, Progress in Mathematics 236, (2008).

[JL92] A. Joseph and G. Letzter *Local finiteness for the adjoint action for quantized enveloping algebras*, J. Algebra 153, (1992), 289-318.

[Jan96] J. Jantzen *Lectures on Quantum groups*, Graduate texts in mathematics (1996).

[JL94] A. Joseph and G. Letzter, *Separation of variables for quantized enveloping algebras*, Amer. J. Math. 116, (1994), 127-177.

[K06] S. Kolb, *On the Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand resolution for Kac-Moody algebras and quantized enveloping algebras*, http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/math/0605460

[Maj93] S. Majid, Braided matrix structure of the Sklyanin algebra and of the quantum Lorentz group, Comm. Math. Phys. 156 (3) (1993) 607638. arXiv:hep-th/9208008.

[M93] S. Montgomery, *Hopf Algebras and Their Actions on Rings*, AMS Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences (1993).

[R85] D. E. Radford, The structure of Hopf algebras with a projection, J. Algebra 92 (2) (1985) 322347.

[Soe86] W. Soergel, *Équivalence de certain catégories de $\mathfrak{g}$-modules*, C.R. Acad Paris Sér 1 303 (1986), no. 15, 725-727.

Erik Backelin, Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad de los Andes, Carrera 1 N. 18A - 10, Bogotá, Colombia
E-mail address: `erbackel@uniandes.edu.co`

Kobi Kremnitzer, Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, 2429 St Giles' Oxford OX1 3LB, UK
E-mail address: `kremnitzer@maths.ox.ac.uk`